

It. at est'n for mendyng of ye gret bel bawdryke	obq ^u
It. we payde for ale for hangyng up of ye gret bel clap'r 	ob
It. we payde a nothyr tyme for mendyng of ye bawdryke 	i ^d
It. we payde for washyng of ye longe cloth yt hangyth be fore ye hye aut'e' 	i ^d
It. we payde for washyng of ye p'she surplice ...	ob
It. we payde for makyng of ye sepulcre at cst'n ...	ob
It. we payde whan we rekenyd wt owr felshippe ...	ob
It. we payde for ye new co'posicon wrytyng ...	ij ^d

(*To be continued.*)

Hurley.

UNDER the heading "3. The Priory of Hurley," in Vol. II. of "The Victoria History of Berkshire," the following passage occurs (page 74), viz: "On a comparatively modern metal plate, fastened to the outer wall of the still standing refectory of Hurley monastery, to the north of the Church is inscribed:— 'Osmund the Good, Count of Seez in Normandy, afterwards Earl of Dorset, and Lord High Chancellor of England, and at last Bishop of Sarum, consecrated this Church of Hurley, A.D. 1086, and died December 4th, 1099, in the reign of William Rufus.' It has lately been stated with some confidence that 1086 cannot have been the exact year, because neither church nor monastery is entered in Domesday Survey;" and here follows an index number in the text which calls attention to a foot-note which runs as follows:—"See papers of Rev. F. T. Wethered on Hurley parish and priory in Vols. II and III of *Berks Arch. Journ.*" And then the passage continues—"but such an omission, as all Domesday students know, proves nothing."

On reading this extract with the appended note I was completely staggered, inasmuch as—so far from my being responsible for the statement that no Church is mentioned in Domesday Book as being at Hurley at the time of the Domesday Survey—in an article of mine on “Hurley,” which appeared in Vol. II—2 (July, 1891) of the *Berks Arch. Journ.*, I gave the full extract from Domesday on Hurley *in prominent type*, in which the words “Ibi Ecclesia” occur.

If there is one doctrine which I hold more strongly than another about the history of Hurley Church it is that a large portion of the present Church was built long before the Norman Conquest. In the paper which I read before the Berkshire Archæological Society on September 17th, 1903, from the pulpit of the Church here, I remarked—“I see no reason why some Saxon Thane should not have been converted at a very early date at Hurley and founded the Church. There are two distinct portions chronologically and architecturally in the structure of the present building, one from the angle on the South East side of the quadrangle (on the Northern flank of the Church) to a point in the rubble wall a few feet West of the old blocked up Norman doorway; while the other extends to the extreme West end.” That is to say—one part is Saxon and the other Norman. And to this I adhere. When Geoffrey de Mandeville refers in his Foundation Charter to “Eccle meæ de hurleia” (I transcribe these words direct from a photograph of the original parchment) he alludes to the Church which he found *in situ* and to which he had already added or was about to add the Western end, on the ground on which it now stands. The nearest approach that can be arrived at as to the date of the Foundation of the Monastery and of the (re) Dedication of the Church at Hurley on the same day, in William the Conqueror’s reign, is 1086—87.

F. T. WETHERED.

Hurley Vicarage, Berks,
October, 1908.